

Subset Codes for Packet Networks

Mladen Kovačević, *Student Member, IEEE*, and Dejan Vukobratović, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—In this paper, we present a coding-theoretic framework for message transmission over packet-switched networks employing routing in network nodes. Network is modeled as a channel which can induce packet erasures, errors, insertions, and out of order delivery of packets. The framework follows closely the one presented by Kötter and Kschischang for networks based on random linear network coding.

Index Terms—Subset codes, packet networks, routing, permutation channel, packet erasure codes, forward error correction.

I. INTRODUCTION

PACKET-SWITCHED networks which employ routing as a means for transmitting packets between pairs of users are in widespread use in communications today [1]. We formulate here a framework for end-to-end forward error correction (FEC) in such networks. We are motivated by the work of Kötter and Kschischang [2] in which the authors define so-called *subspace codes* and show that these codes, and particularly their constant-dimension versions, are adequate constructions for error and erasure recovery in networks employing random linear network coding. We will follow closely their exposition in Section III since the scenario considered here yields a very similar mathematical model.

II. PACKET NETWORKS

Consider a pair of users in a given packet-switched network, one user being the source and the other the destination of the message (we consider only unicast here, but the generalization to multicast is straightforward). The message sent by the source consists of ℓ packets. Due to varying topology and load, these packets can be sent over different routes in the network and, as a consequence, they are received in practically arbitrary order. This is especially true for, e.g., mobile ad-hoc networks where the topology is rapidly changing, and heavily loaded datagram-based networks in which the packets are frequently redirected in order to balance the load over different parts of the network. Hence, we will model networks as *packet permutation channels* which can deliver injected packets in arbitrary order at the destination. Apart from permutations, there are various other unwanted effects the network can impose on injected packets. We consider here three of them: erasures (deletions), errors, and insertions. Packet erasures can occur for many reasons, finite buffering capabilities of routers, router/link failures, etc. Errors are caused by noise, malfunctioning of network equipment, etc. Finally, packet

insertions are a form of malicious behaviour, where some user imitates the true source of the data, and wants the receiver to misinterpret the data. To sum up, in this paper, networks are modeled as permutation channels with erasures, errors, and insertions.

III. CODES FOR PACKET NETWORKS

Let us start by a somewhat general approach. Consider a communication channel acting on an input by some randomized transformation (not including errors, erasures, insertions, deletions, etc.). In the case of routed networks, this transformation corresponds to permuting the packets in an unpredictable and essentially random way. In the case of random linear network coding (RLNC), the transformation represents random linear combining of the packets, and so on. The idea of sending information through such channels is very simple: *Encode the information in an object which is invariant under the given transformation*. This has led Kötter and Kschischang [2] to the abstraction of the channel corresponding to RLNC networks (the operator channel) and the definition of codes for such a channel. In this case, the object which is invariant to random linear combining of packets is the vector space spanned by those packets¹.

In the case under consideration here, namely routed packet networks, we need an object which is invariant under random permutations of the packets. Such an object is a *set*. Therefore, a natural idea is to consider sets as possible “codewords” for this channel. As in any code, the codewords need to be sufficiently far apart so as to enable the receiver to recover from erasures and errors. In the following subsection we will define these codes, named *subset codes*, in a precise (and somewhat abstract) way. Section III-B explains subset codes through more concrete examples.

A. Power sets and subset codes

Let S be a finite set, and let $\mathcal{P}(S)$ denote the power set of S , i.e., the set of all subsets of S . A natural metric associated with this space is defined by:

$$d(X, Y) = |X \Delta Y| \quad (1)$$

for $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}(S)$, where Δ denotes the symmetric difference between sets. It can also be written as $d(X, Y) = |X \cup Y| - |X \cap Y| = |X| + |Y| - 2|X \cap Y| = 2|X \cup Y| - |X| - |Y|$. This distance is the length of the shortest path between X and Y in the Hasse diagram [3] of the lattice of subsets of S ordered by inclusion. It is analogous to the subspace metric defined in [2]. This diagram plays a role similar to the Hamming hypercube

¹ Strictly speaking, it is invariant only with high probability, i.e., if the transformation is full-rank.

This work is supported by the Ministry of Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia (grants No. TR32040 and III44003).

The authors are with the Department of Power, Electronics, and Communication Engineering, University of Novi Sad, Serbia. E-mails: {kmladen, dejanv}@uns.ac.rs.

for the classical codes in the Hamming metric (actually, it is isomorphic to the Hamming hypercube, see Section IV). Another useful metric is given by:

$$d'(X, Y) = \max\{|X \setminus Y|, |Y \setminus X|\}. \quad (2)$$

It can also be written as $d'(X, Y) = \max\{|X|, |Y|\} - |X \cap Y| = |X \cup Y| - \min\{|X|, |Y|\}$, and it is analogous to the injection metric for subspace codes [4]. Direct proofs that d and d' are indeed metrics are easy and very similar to the proofs for subspace and injection metrics, and we shall therefore omit them. In the following, we will only use distance d and refer to it as the *subset metric*.

One can define codes in the space $\mathcal{P}(S)$ in the usual way. Namely, a *subset code* $\mathcal{C}$ is simply a nonempty subset of $\mathcal{P}(S)$. Important parameters of such a code are its cardinality, $|\mathcal{C}|$, minimum distance:

$$\min_{X, Y \in \mathcal{C}, X \neq Y} d(X, Y), \quad (3)$$

maximum cardinality of the codewords:

$$\max_{X \in \mathcal{C}} |X|, \quad (4)$$

and the cardinality of the ambient set, $|S|$. If $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(S)$ has minimum distance d , and every codeword is of cardinality at most ℓ , we say that it is a code of type $[\log |S|, \log |\mathcal{C}|, d; \ell]$ (the base of the logarithm is generally arbitrary; we will assume that it is 2, and hence that the lengths of the messages are measured in bits). If all codewords of $\mathcal{C}$ are of cardinality ℓ , we say that it is a constant cardinality code. A significant advantage of constant cardinality codes is that the receiver knows in advance how many packets it needs to receive in order to initiate decoding, similarly to the constant dimension codes in projective spaces [2]. The rate of an $[n, k, d; \ell]$ code is defined by:

$$R = \frac{k}{n\ell}. \quad (5)$$

In the intended application of subset codes, S will be the set of all possible packets, $n = \log |S|$ the length of each packet, and ℓ the number of packets one codeword contains. The source maps information sequence of length k bits to a codeword which is a set consisting of ℓ packets of length n bits each, and sends these ℓ packets through a channel. In the channel, these packets are permuted, some of them are erased, some of them are received erroneously, and possibly some new packets are inserted by a malicious user. The receiver collects all these packets and attempts to reconstruct the codeword which was sent, i.e., the information sequence which corresponds to this codeword.

With the above terminology at hand, one can also define the channel described in Section II in a more precise way. Namely, we observe a discrete memoryless channel with input and output alphabets equal to $\mathcal{P}(S)$. The channel is completely described by its transition probabilities (the probabilities of mapping the input subset X to the output subset Y , for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}(S)$) which, on the other hand, are determined by the joint statistics of erasures, errors, and insertions of the elements of S .

We next prove a simple, but basic fact about the correcting capabilities of subset codes.

Theorem 1: Assume that a code $\mathcal{C}$ of type $[n, k, d; \ell]$ is used for transmitting packets over a network. Then any pattern of ρ erasures, t errors, and s insertions can be corrected by the minimum distance decoder (with respect to the subset metric), as long as $2(\rho + 2t + s) < d$.

Proof: Let $X \in \mathcal{C}$ be the set/codeword which is transmitted through a channel. Let Y be the received set. If ρ packets from X have been deleted, and s new packets have been inserted, then we easily deduce that $|X \cap Y| \geq |X| - \rho$ and $|Y| \leq |X| - \rho + s$. Observe further that errors can be regarded as combinations of erasures and insertions. Namely, an erroneous packet can be thought of as being inserted, while the original packet has been erased. Therefore, the actual number of erasures and insertions is (at most) $\rho + t$ and $s + t$, respectively. We therefore conclude that $|X \cap Y| \geq |X| - \rho - t$ and $|Y| \leq |X| - \rho + s$, and so

$$d(X, Y) = |X| + |Y| - 2|X \cap Y| \leq \rho + 2t + s. \quad (6)$$

Now, if $2(\rho + 2t + s) < d$, then $d(X, Y) \leq \lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor$ and therefore X can be recovered from Y . ■

If only erasures are allowed in the channel, we will have $d(X, Y) = \rho$ and a sufficient condition for unique decodability will be $\rho \leq \lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor$.

B. Examples of subset codes

In this section, we give a simple example of subset codes to illustrate the above definitions.

How does one encode information in a set? One possible solution (which is widely used in practice) is to add a sequence number to every packet sent, thus achieving resilience to arbitrary permutations. To illustrate this, assume that the source has two packets to send, p_0 and p_1 . Note that, from the point of view of the receiver, the sequence (p_0, p_1) is not the same as the sequence (p_1, p_0) ; these two sequences carry different information. In the permutation channel, however, either of these two sequences can be received when (p_0, p_1) is sent. The sender therefore sends (q_0, q_1) instead, where $q_i = (i, p_i)$ is the new packet formed by prepending a sequence number to the packet p_i . Note that sequences (q_0, q_1) and (q_1, q_0) are now identical to the receiver because in both cases it will extract (p_0, p_1) and further process these packets. This means that the carrier of information is actually a set $\{q_0, q_1\} = \{(0, p_0), (1, p_1)\}$. This approach, combined with some classical packet-level error-correcting code, provides an example of subset codes that we describe next.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the set of all packets the source can possibly send. Assume that $|\mathcal{A}| = 2^m$, so that we can think of information packets as having m bits. Assume further that the source wishes to send k such packets, $p_0, \dots, p_{k-1}$ to a destination over a network, i.e., over a permutation channel with erasures, errors, and insertions. To protect the packets the source defines some packet-level block code (see, e.g., [5]), and uses the corresponding encoder to map these k packets to $\ell > k$ packets, $q_0, \dots, q_{\ell-1}$. To cope with the permutations in the channel, the source further adds a sequence number of length

$\log_2 \ell$ bits² to every packet q_i . This gives a subset code of type $[m + \log_2 \ell, km, d; \ell]$, where d is its minimum distance whose concrete value is irrelevant for this example. In words, the length of the packets is $m + \log_2 \ell$ bits, there are 2^{km} possible information sequences (and hence the same number of codewords), and each codeword consists of ℓ packets. The rate of the code is therefore $R = \frac{km}{\ell(m + \log_2 \ell)}$.

To further clarify the above arguments, assume that the Reed-Solomon code is used as a packet-level block code in the above scenario. Namely, the message to be sent (k packets, $p_0, \dots, p_{k-1}$, of length m bits each) is being regarded as a polynomial of degree at most $k - 1$ over $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}$:

$$u(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} p_i z^i. \quad (7)$$

The codeword represents the sequence of evaluations of this polynomial in ℓ fixed different points in $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}$. Denote these points by $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell$, so that the codeword is $u(\alpha_1), \dots, u(\alpha_\ell)$. The resulting code has minimum (Hamming) distance $\ell - k + 1$ [6]. Now, $u(\alpha_i)$'s are being treated as packets (these are the q_i 's from the previous paragraph), and each packet is being added a sequence number i (index of the point of evaluation of the message polynomial). As already explained, these sequence numbers enable the receiver to recover from permutations, but also from erasures, errors, and insertions because it can keep track of evaluation points. Finally, the codeword corresponding to the information sequence $(p_0, \dots, p_{k-1})$ is a set $U = \{(i, u(\alpha_i)) : i = 0, \dots, k - 1\}$. Since two polynomials u and v of degree $k - 1$ can agree on at most $k - 1$ different points, we conclude that $|U \cap V| \leq k - 1$ and therefore $d(U, V) \geq 2(\ell - k + 1)$. Thus, we have defined a constant cardinality subset code of type $[m + \log_2 \ell, km, 2(\ell - k + 1); \ell]$, and rate:

$$R = \frac{km}{\ell(m + \log_2 \ell)}. \quad (8)$$

This example is analogous to the construction of Kötter-Kschischang codes [2] for networks based on random linear network coding.

Even though RS codes are maximum distance separable [6], the subset codes obtained in this way are not. Namely, adding a sequence number is not an optimal way of encoding information in a set (though this suboptimality is not a concern in practice, because sequence numbers only take a couple of bytes in the packet header). The other reason for non-optimality is that these codes are constant cardinality codes; larger codes can be obtained if one allows codewords of different cardinality. This is analogous to the relation of general subspace codes in projective spaces and constant dimension codes [7]. In Section IV we discuss how one can construct optimal (in any sense) subset codes.

IV. ANOTHER APPROACH TO SUBSET CODES

Let S be a nonempty finite set with some implied ordering of its elements, and observe the space $\{0, 1\}^{|S|}$ of all binary sequences of length $|S|$ (denoted also 2^S). Each binary sequence

$\mathbf{x} \in 2^S$ defines a subset $X \subseteq S$ containing elements defined by the positions of ones in $\mathbf{x}$. As is well-known, this mapping of subsets to binary sequences is an isomorphism between groups $(\mathcal{P}(S), \Delta)$ and $(2^S, \oplus)$, where $\oplus$ denotes the XOR operation (addition modulo 2). Furthermore, it is easy to show that the Hamming distance between two sequences $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in 2^S$ is precisely the subset distance between the corresponding subsets $X, Y \subseteq S$:

$$d_H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = w_H(\mathbf{x} \oplus \mathbf{y}) = |X \Delta Y| = d(X, Y), \quad (9)$$

where w_H denotes the Hamming weight of the binary sequence. In other words, this mapping is also an isometry between metric spaces $(\mathcal{P}(S), d)$ and $(2^S, d_H)$. This means that the subset codes in fact represent only another way to look at classical codes in the *binary* Hamming space, and vice versa. Constant cardinality codes are then analogous to constant weight binary codes. Note that the classical binary codes corresponding to $[n, k, d; \ell]$ subset codes have parameters $(2^n, k, d)$.

The above reasoning, though quite elementary, has an important implication. It shows that classical binary codes developed for binary channels (such as the Binary Symmetric Channel) define in a very natural way codes for correcting erasures, errors, and insertions in networks. In other words, *the study of subset codes and their properties reduces to the well-known theory of binary codes*.

The following simple example illustrates the above notions.

Example 1: Let $S = \{a, b, c, d\}$. Any subset of S can be identified by a binary sequence of length 4; for example $\{a, b\} \leftrightarrow 1100$, $\{b, d\} \leftrightarrow 0101$, etc. Consider now some code in $\{0, 1\}^4$, e.g., $\mathcal{C} = \{1100, 1010, 0110, 0011\}$. The subset counterpart of this code is then $\mathcal{C}_S = \{\{a, b\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}, \{c, d\}\}$. The distance between two subsets of S is the Hamming distance between the corresponding binary sequences, for example:

$$d(\{a, b\}, \{a, c\}) = |\{b, c\}| = 2 = d_H(1100, 1010) \quad (10)$$

so that all properties of $\mathcal{C}$ directly translate into equivalent properties of the subset code $\mathcal{C}_S$. The code $\mathcal{C}_S$ is a constant cardinality code of type $[2, 2, 2; 2]$.

The above example can be extended to arbitrary sets S and binary codes $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^S$.

V. SOME PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

To conclude the paper, we give below some comments on subset codes and the channel model that could be relevant for their analysis in practical scenarios.

Comments on binary codes: One constraint on the binary codes corresponding to $[n, k, d; \ell]$ subset codes should be pointed out. Namely, "practical" subset codes will certainly require that $\ell \ll 2^n$, i.e., that the number of packets in one codeword is much less than the number of all possible packets. This means that binary codes corresponding to (practically feasible) subset codes will only have small weight codewords. Moreover, the fact that binary codes corresponding to $[n, k, d; \ell]$ subset codes have exponential length (2^n) places additional complexity constraints on the code design.

² For notational simplicity we disregard the fact that the actual length is $\lceil \log_2 \ell \rceil$.

Comments on the channel model: The links in networks can generally be unreliable. For example, if a large packet is sent over a wireless link, it is highly probable that it will be hit by an error, i.e., that at least one of its bits/symbols will be received incorrectly. Furthermore, this error probability increases with the packet length n . In such a scenario it can happen (with fairly high probability) that all of the packets from the sent codeword are erroneous, in which case $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ and reliable recovery is impossible. Subset codes alone do not provide a good protection from errors in such cases. One way to solve this problem is to additionally protect each packet with its own error correcting or error detecting code. This solution is in agreement with current networking practice. Namely, since we treat here an end-to-end network model, it is assumed implicitly that (subset) coding is done on the transport (or even application) layer. In most networks, packets on lower layers (e.g., link and physical layer) include some error correcting/error detecting codes (such as LDPC codes for error correction combined with CRC codes for error detection). These codes effectively create a channel that we treat here, namely, they keep the link-layer packet error probability at a "reasonable" level.

Packet insertions also deserve a comment regarding possible practical applications of subset codes. In general, by inserting enough packets an adversary can always prevent the receiver from correctly decoding the received set. Thus we also assume in our model that the number of insertions is relatively small,

or at least that it behaves as a random variable whose parameters we can estimate and then design the code with respect to this estimated channel statistics. This may not be the case in practice because insertions inherently represent deliberate interference, but our assumption can certainly be achieved by a proper authentication protocol; that way the receiver will recognize and disregard (most of) the inserted packets. That is to say that subset codes do *not* provide any cryptographic protection; insertions are treated here because they naturally fit in the model, along with erasures and errors.

We note that the above comments on errors and insertions are also valid for subspace codes in network coded networks.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. P. Bertsekas and R. Gallager, *Data networks*, 2nd ed., Prentice Hall, 1992.
- [2] R. Kötter and F. R. Kschischang, "Coding for Errors and Erasures in Random Network Coding", *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54 (8), pp. 3579–3591, Aug. 2008.
- [3] G. Birkhoff, *Lattice Theory*, 3rd ed., American Mathematical Society, 1967.
- [4] D. Silva and F. R. Kschischang, "On Metrics for Error Correction in Network Coding", *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55 (12), pp. 5479–5490, Dec. 2009.
- [5] L. Rizzo, "Effective Erasure Codes for Reliable Computer Communication Protocols", *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 27 (2), pp. 24–36, Apr. 1997.
- [6] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*, North-Holland Publishing Company, 1977.
- [7] T. Etzion and A. Vardy, "Error-Correcting Codes in Projective Space", *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57 (2), pp. 1165–1173, Feb. 2011.